

April 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1905

Approved For Release 2003/10/22 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500170025-2

ATOR WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, the cigar-smoking chairman of the Commerce Committee, will prove reluctant to leave the health of the young within reach of the admen.

Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Star of April 17, 1965, entitled "Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This article was written in connection with the Consultation on Church Union, which met in Lexington last week, and it pays tribute to the town, its people, and the memory of a great Kentuckian, Henry Clay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 17, 1965]

THE HUMAN SIDE OF RELIGION: LEXINGTON, KY., KEEPS CLAY'S MEMORY FRESH
(By Caspar Nannies)

The memory of Henry Clay, the great Kentucky Senator who ran for President three times, is still very much alive in Lexington, Ky., where the Consultation on Church Union met last week.

There is a large and attractive Henry Clay High School plus many other institutions and places of business using the statesman's revered name. Nearly 100 student band members of the high school came to Washington last Sunday to take part in the Cherry Blossom Festival parade along Constitution Avenue.

Recently, Clay's still-beautiful home in a fine residential section of Lexington was designated by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall as "a registered national historic landmark."

DESIGNED BY LATROBE

It is good this was done, for the building and the surrounding estate are visual monuments to the glories of an earlier period in our country's life. Born in Hanover County Va., Clay came to Lexington in 1797 when a young man of 20. About 1805 he bought land for his home. Seven years later he added to it, so that he owned about 400 acres when Benjamin Latrobe, architect of the U.S. Capitol, designed the building.

Taking cognizance of the many majestic ash trees on the grounds, Clay named his home Ashland. A great deal of the ash woodwork in the house came from the trees on the estate.

Ashland is two stories high in the center, with wings of one story on either side. Today it is partially covered by ivy, adding a special charm to the 18th-century style of architecture. The building, set back from the street, is surrounded by well-kept gardens, 50 kinds of trees and numerous walks.

Four Presidents—three while in office—visited at Ashland. They were James Madison, James Monroe, Martin Van Buren and Abraham Lincoln. The last came before he was elected President. His wife, Mary Todd, was born in Lexington, knew the Clays intimately and visited them frequently. After moving to Springfield, Ill., and marrying

Lincoln, she brought him to Lexington for a visit.

Daniel Webster and Marquis de Lafayette also were among the great figures to stay at Ashland. The latter visited Clay in 1825.

FURNITURE REMAINS

Ashland has been kept very much as it was in Clay's time. Much of the original furniture, some of which had been brought from France, is still in the home.

Statues, statuettes, and portraits of Clay are everywhere. A huge oil portrait, copied by Andrews in 1853 from the John Neagle painting which belongs to the Union League of Philadelphia, hangs at the top of the stairway at the second floor.

Probably best remembered for his Missouri Compromise of 1821, Clay played a leading role in laws still influencing our Nation. Among them were legislation for good roads, stabilizing the national currency and laying down fiscal policies that still affect the banking system.

Recently Members of the U.S. Senate voted to honor the five most influential Senators by having their portraits painted and hung near the Senate Chamber. Those chosen were Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Robert M. LaFollette, Robert A. Taft, and Henry Clay. It was reported Clay received the highest number of ballots.

TWO MORE KENTUCKIANS

Press rooms are too often uncomfortable, poorly lighted places set aside by conventions as an afterthought. But those at the Phoenix Hotel during the Consultation on Church Union were light, airy, and spacious.

Perhaps this came about because the two rooms were named after famous Kentucky figures—Stephen C. Foster and John C. Breckenridge.

Foster's fame is still fresh as his beloved songs—"My Old Kentucky Home," "Old Black Joe," "Swanee River" among others—are still sung.

Breckenridge, one of three candidates who opposed Lincoln in the 1860 presidential election, has receded into history for most people, but his importance receives tribute in Kentucky.

SOLDIER HONORED

Another home having historic associations stands a few streets from the heart of Lexington—the Morgan house. Set in a quiet neighborhood near Transylvania College, oldest school of higher education west of the Alleghenies, the building of gray stones, white doors, and narrow elongated windows is enclosed by a low iron fence. Behind the house is a small garden with shade trees and red brick walks.

Outside the house a plaque has been erected. It states this is the "Home of John Hunt Morgan, 'Thunderbolt of the Confederacy'; born, Huntsville, Ala., June 1, 1825; killed at Greenville, Tenn., September 4, 1864; lieutenant, Kentucky Volunteers in the Mexican War, 1846-47; major general, CSA (Confederate States of America), 1861-64."

A legend still heard in Lexington is that on one occasion Morgan rode his horse into the livingroom of the house, leaned down to kiss his mother goodby, and then galloped the animal out the other side as pursuing Union soldiers came on the scene.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1, as amended because I believe the U.S. Constitution is not only ambiguous, but defective, on the subject of presidential disability and that we, as a nation, have been extremely fortunate that our Presidents have been able to discharge their constitutional responsibilities. The office of Vice President was made vacant due to the tragic death of President Kennedy and there has been no procedure for filling it.

In support of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the American Bar Association and its affiliate, the National Forum, I submitted a bill of my own, House Joint Resolution 236, for not only does my bill support House Joint Resolution 1, it calls attention to the problem relating to the period of time before a disabled President should resume the powers and duties of his office.

I know the people of my district would want me to speak out in favor of such an amendment to the Constitution because they are very aware of the problems created by the tragic death of President Kennedy. I was encouraged by the fact that my remarks—made at the many meetings throughout my district prior to my election—on the Senate resolution passed during the 88th Congress engendered much public interest and support.

In my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee I made no references to history. This had been most carefully documented and repetition is unnecessary. I merely wanted to emphasize that prudence requires this representative body to act now to submit to the State legislatures an amendment to correct a defect known to us for many, many years.

In addition to supporting the overall effort, I wanted to point out to the committee what I considered to be a danger in the event a President would transmit to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists. The aforementioned resolution originally provided that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive department, or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within 2 days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

My question was: What could happen within that 2-day period in the event an incompetent President resumed the duties of his office and issued orders affecting the security of the Nation? While I agreed that the President should be able to regain the powers and duties of his office easily when his inability ceases to exist, nevertheless, the Vice President should have time to file a written declaration with the Congress before the presumption in favor of the President's ability is restored.

April 21, 1965

To accomplish this, I provided in my resolution that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office on the third day following the transmittal of such declaration to the Congress unless, prior to the end of the third day, the Vice President, with the appropriate consent of executive department heads, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. I used 3 days on the theory that the President's written declaration could be submitted on Friday and Congress might not be in session over the weekend.

However, during the committee deliberations the majority adopted language, as set forth in section 4 of House Joint Resolution 1, which I find to be satisfactory and will correct for the most part that which my resolution points out as needing clarification.

I support this resolution and urge its passage.

Farmers Can't Tailor Production to Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Clifford R. Hope, formerly a Congressman from Kansas, and the esteemed chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, continues to serve Kansas in a number of ways. In his widely read column published in the *Salina Journal*, Cliff Hope explains in a few short paragraphs the problems of agriculture in general, the plight of the farmer, and the effect of pending Federal legislation on the agriculture of western Kansas.

I ask that this concise, informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS CAN'T TAILOR PRODUCTION TO DEMAND (By Clifford R. Hope)

Most of the economic problems which affect farmers today have come about because farm capacity for production has increased faster than effective demand for farm products.

The greater part of the benefits of this increased capacity and efficiency has gone to consumers. Our people as a whole are spending a smaller part of their income for food than ever before in this or any other nation.

The farmer's trouble is that he is unable fully to participate in our economic system, where prices in general are based on supply and demand. Other producers are in a position to equate production with market demand. They produce what they think they can sell. Even if they miscalculate, they can make adjustments before too much harm is done.

Labor, through organization and legislation, has seen to it that workers get their share of increased efficiency in industry—not only in wage increases and protection against unemployment, but in retirement

provisions and other fringe benefits. This fits in with our general economic system and strengthens it.

NO WAY FOR FARMERS

But 3 million widely scattered farmers competing with each other, whose production depends on the vagaries of the weather and the uncertainties of plant and animal diseases, and whose products are for the most part perishable, have no way to use the devices available to other producers to adjust supply to expected demand.

The principle of using the instrumentalities of government to do those things which need to be done, and which people cannot do for themselves, has been accepted and used since our birth as a nation. This is the basis of our Government farm programs. Some have succeeded, some have failed. It has been a matter of trial and error. A lot has been learned by experience.

Perhaps the most important lesson has been that each commodity or group of commodities has its separate problems. That is easily illustrated in western Kansas where four-fifths of our farm income is derived from three commodities—wheat, cattle, and feed grains. While all three of them may be, and frequently are produced on the same farm, there are differences in both production and marketing which put each in a different category as far as farm programs are concerned.

CATTLE FUTURE GOOD

For many years cattle have been produced almost entirely for the domestic market, although byproducts like hides and tallow have been exported. Traditionally, the policy has been to afford some protection from imports by duties on both live cattle and beef. Sanitary regulations have also had the effect of restricting imports. Recently enacted legislation has imposed quotas on a moderate scale. This, together with increasing world demand, has reduced imports considerably below the levels of a year or so ago. Domestic prices are also more stable. While there will always be ups and downs, the future for cattle in western Kansas looks good.

Until recently, feed grains have been grown mostly for domestic consumption. Since they are largely fed on the farms where grown, or in the same area, market prices are not as important as livestock prices although they are necessarily related. Hybrid corn and sorghums, together with expanded use of fertilizer, better farming practices and irrigation, have substantially expanded production.

EXPORT FEED

New markets in Western Europe and Japan have increased feed grain exports tremendously. Prospects for further expansion are good. During the past year or two it has been possible to export without a subsidy.

Voluntary acreage diversion programs in recent years plus exports has resulted in diminishing the carryover to reasonable proportions. It is expected that the 2-year program now in effect which also provides for substitution between feed grains and wheat will be extended during this congressional session.

REALISTIC PLANS

As to wheat, the programs offered under the McGovern and Young-Carlson bills in the Senate and the Purcell bill in the House, all of which extend the present voluntary program with some improvements, are expertly tailored to meet today's problems. It is understood that the administration bill will be similar.

The wheat and feed grain bills which I have mentioned and the quota legislation on beef imports, while differing in many particulars, have two important things in common. One is that each deals realistically and effectively with the special prob-

lems of the commodity affected. The other is that taken together, they constitute a consistent overall program for most of our agricultural activities in western Kansas.

Oklahoma's Kay Bass Named Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., who is one of my constituents and also one of my best friends, was recently named "Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964" by the National Cotton Ginner's Association.

This is the highest honor possible for a member of the cotton ginning industry. I have known Kay Bass for many years. While I knew of his great abilities as a cotton ginner only by reputations, I have always known personally of his great human abilities. He is a man of character, intelligence, and affable charm. I am proud of his receiving this great honor and enclose for all Members an article which appeared in the April 10 issue of the *Cotton Gin & Old Mill Press*:

NATION'S TOP GINNER IS PRODUCER AND MERCHANT

Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., is well aware of the problem when the cotton merchant tells the ginner the mills want a better quality cotton. He's equally familiar with the ginner's dilemma when he tells the grower to get cotton to the gin in the cleanest possible condition.

You see, Kay Bass is all three—grower, merchant and ginner. And he has combined all three into a successful business. His work in the ginning industry earned him the Horace Hayden Memorial Trophy as the Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964. This is the highest recognition given a member of the industry by the National Cotton Ginner's Association.

Bass has a background in merchandising cotton that dates back to his childhood. "I sampled cotton for my dad from the time I was able to cut a bale," he added. "That's when they brought cotton in by wagon to the square."

He admits he bought his first gin to stay in the cotton business. He bought an interest in the gin at Kenefic, Okla., north of Durant, in 1956. They later bought a gin at Coalgate.

Bass went to work in 1933 with the Cotton Co-op Association buying cotton in the Horthart area. He passed the Government classifier's examination in Oklahoma City and returned to Durant in 1937. He classed cotton for the Government program in 1938, and operated his own I.O.B. business from 1938 to 1956. "That's when I saw the handwriting on the wall," he explains, "and got into the ginning business."

He merchandises the cotton he gins. From the producers' viewpoint—and he qualifies with 450 acres of cotton—Bass believes the small acreage producers may be on the way out. "Looks like the 15- to 25-acre farmer is a thing of the past. His cost of production is so high." Bass compares the operation with a small business in town. They major factor is volume.

"This loss may force some gins to close up," he adds. "There's no question we are